“Resilience” has been advocated in many fields as a remedy that can help to deal with turmoil situations (Gao et al., 2016). Supply chain management (SCM) has jumped on this bandwagon more than a decade ago, developing insights on antecedents and resilience’s performance efficacy along the way (e.g.; Christopher and Peck, 2004; Sheffi and Rice Jr., 2005; Pettit et al., 2010; Wieland and Wallenburg, 2013; Durach and Machuca, 2018). However, upon reflection, we concur with Davoudi (2012, p. 299) in “that it is not quite clear [yet] what resilience means, beyond the simple assumption that it is good to be resilient.”

A long-running debate revolves around different meanings of resilience. Maybe most prominently, Holling (1973; 1996) has made a distinction between engineering and ecological resilience. He suggests that the former relates to the ability to “bounce back” and the latter to the ability to “bounce forth” building on an organisms’ ability to persist and adapt. Both interpretations take a strong cybernetic and positivist perspective. SCM has often interpreted resilience the former way suggesting that there is one equilibrium the system should get back to. But is it really about bouncing back, forth or something in-between in SCM?

Several authors, including Folke et al. (2010), Evans (2011) and Davoudi (2012), have recently challenged the equilibrium-focused meaning of resilience and proposed an alternative called evolutionary or socio-ecological resilience. The literature on resilience in SCM is surprisingly disconnected to these debates. It is thus one of the key questions concerning how our understanding of the supply chain as a system and the modern understanding of resilience can be integrated.

The intention of this special topic forum (STF) is to prevent resilience from becoming just another buzzword by integrating our perspective with fields such as ecology, engineering, psychology or environmental planning and, simultaneously, contributing to the wider resilience debate. At the same time, studies contributing to the STF should provide true “SCM perspectives” on resilience. Studies that fit into this STF should explicitly address multiple supply chain actors, as resilience to supply chain events is commonly the outcome of interactions amongst multiple actors in the network. “Supply chain actors” thereby refers to a variety of entities, e.g. tier-n buyers and suppliers, service providers, recycling companies, NGOs, infrastructure providers, consumers and users, society at large, local communities, pressure groups, voluntary organizations, and law-makers.

Studies can contribute to this STF in different ways, including (but not limited to):
- integrating recent developments in the resilience literature inside and outside of SCM,
- challenging existing meanings of resilience in the light of SCM phenomena,
- covering ethical, social and ecological harm caused by today’s consumerist business models (e.g. planetary boundaries), and/or proposing pathways towards alleviating such harm (e.g. transitions from linear to circular business models, consumer orientation to user orientation, and value creation to value retention).

The STF call is open to various research methods. The study can adopt any methodology that fits the research question. We explicitly encourage authors to follow non-positivist methods of theorizing from case studies (see Welch et al., 2011) if this helps to make a strong contribution by challenging conventional theory (e.g. the meanings of resilience described above).

All topically appropriate papers will go through JBL’s double-blind review process. Submission deadline for full consideration will be June 1, 2019. However, we will process submissions as they come in. Please submit your paper via Manuscript Central (http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jbl). Indicate in your cover letter that it is for this STF.

Guest editors are: Andreas Wieland (awi.om@cbs.dk) and Christian F. Durach (cdurach@escpeurope.eu)
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